REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Favorable reconsideration of the subject application is requested in view of the comments made herein.

Claims 7-11 were objected to for failure to comply with 37 CFR 1.121 (c). These claims are now identified as being withdrawn in response to the previous election. Claims 7-11 are now listed as withdrawn, as shown above.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugihara (US 5,522,141), in view of Fogle (US 7,000,324). Claim 1 has been amended to state, in pertinent part, "said opening (19) is ~~non-circular~~ V-shaped having a first and a second end (21, 22)… wherein the V-shaped opening (19) of the eyelet (17) allows access to all sections (11, 12) to reload the cutting filament (13, 14) in such a way that the bobbin (10) is kept in the trimmer head during the reloading." Both Sugihara and Fogle do not describe such a structure, nor would a combination of these references describe such a structure.

The trimmer head recited in claim 1 makes it easier for the operator to reload the bobbin with a new line of cutting filament. To accomplish this, the bobbin is kept in the trimmer head during reloading. One end of the new line of cutting filament is put through the eyelet where the filament that will be used exits the trimmer head housing. The end of the new line of cutting filament is put further in so that it enters an opening in the bobbin placed in the section of the bobbin where the filament is supposed to be stored. The bobbin is then rotated

so that the end of the cutting filament is locked in the opening in the bobbin and the cutting filament is winded on the bobbin when it is rotated further.

As noted, this eyelet is intended for trimmer heads that are reloaded with cutting filament without removing the trimmer head housing. Thus, the eyelet of the trimmer head recited in claim 1 provides a sufficient opening size to allow for the cutting filament to be introduced all the way into the fastening area for the filament within each section of the trimmer head. The V-shaped opening of the trimmer head recited in claim 1 provides access to the different sections on the bobbin for storing lines of cutting filament in a way that a combination of the Sugihara and Fogle references would not describe.

For example, the V-shape configuration of the eyelet opening of the trimmer head recited in claim 1 makes it possible for the operator to refill the bobbin easily since the eyelet provides access to each of the sections on the bobbin and the openings to the locking devices for lines of cutting filament on the bobbin. The shape of the opening provides access to both sections on the bobbin via the first and the second ends that extend in diagonal direction from the tip of the V-shaped opening. The cutting filaments are then placed in a groove when the trimmer head rotates no matter which section of the bobbin the filament is stored in.

Fogle, as noted in the previous Office action, describes an outlet/opening that appears to approximate the shape of a rectangle (see FIGS. 4 and 5a). Moreover, Fogle appears to require removal of the trimmer head via a fastener 26 to reload the line. As described in column 4, line 62- column 5, line 3, the line

is replaced from the inside near the hub to the outside. The line cannot be replaced without removing the trimmer head housing.

Sugihara, as noted in the previous Office action, fails to describe a non-circular opening. Sugihara describes two types of systems to reload the cutting filament. The first system automatically feeds a cord in response to cord wear. The first cord feeding system is arranged to disengage either the bobbin or rotor from the engine to feed a predetermined length of the cord through the cord feed slot. The disengaged bobbin or rotor slips relative to the other when it is disengaged. The second system feeds the cord in response to a tapping operation that is executed while the cutting head is being driven. The second system disconnects either the bobbin or rotor from the engine in response to a tapping operation. Again, this causes the disengaged bobbin or rotor to slip relative to the other. The bobbin is either disengaged or disconnected from the engine by either system. In distinction, the trimmer head recited in claim 1 states that the bobbin is kept in the trimmer head when the cord is reloaded.

Accordingly, one with ordinary skill in the art would not combine the apparatus described in Sugihara, with the rectangular opening and the process of replacing the line while removing the trimmer head housing described in Fogle, to arrive at the trimmer head recited in claim 1. Thus, neither Sugihara nor Fogle, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the structure required in amended claim 1, as required by law to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ABE1-39642.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Bryan M. Gallo/
Bryan M. Gallo– Reg. No. 59814

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 24, 2009